UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/749,828	12/31/2003	Patrick Wood	7000-452	1827	
	7590 12/08/200 TERRANOVA, P.L.L.		EXAMINER		
100 REGENCY FOREST DRIVE			HONG, HARRY S		
SUITE 160 CARY, NC 275	518		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2614		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/08/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/749,828	WOOD ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Harry S. Hong	2614					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT rute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. Oly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this on the MOONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11	Sentember 2008						
	nis action is non-final.						
<i>;</i> —		rs prosecution as to the	merits is				
·— · · ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	•						
·	nding in the application						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-17,19-29 and 31-36</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	awir irom consideration.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-17,19-29 and 31-36</u> is/are rej	<u>, </u>						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Colod.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election requirement						
	yor olootion roquirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 December 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prapplication from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Ap riority documents have been r eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	nmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application -					

Application/Control Number: 10/749,828 Page 2

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 1-3, 15-17, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Wood et al. (Wood; 6,091,808; cited by the examiner and applied

for the second time) in view of Isono (6,011,841; cited by the examiner and applied for the first time).

With respect to the independent claims, the entire patent to Wood plainly teaches the claimed method and systems for accessing call-related information associated with telephony services via a public data network; refer to Figs. 1-3. The claimed subscriber terminal reads on the WEB BROWSER 12. The claimed plurality of telephony network nodes read on the TELEPHONE SWITCH 16. The claimed converting the request for call-related information into a format compatible with the plurality of telephony network nodes and transmitting the converted call-related information request to a telephony network node have to be inherent and take place between the WEB FACILITY 22 and the TELEPHONE SWITCH 26; some type of converting must take place in order for the WEB FACILITY 22 and the TELEPHONE SWITCH 26 to communicate. Wood ultimately teaches the log of call-related information (Fig. 3) is transmitted to the subscriber terminal.

With respect to claims 2 and 16, Wood teaches receiving from the subscriber terminal a request to activate a telephony service; see column 9, lines 46 - 64.

With respect to claims 3 and 17, Wood teaches receiving from the subscriber terminal a request to initiate a call to a directory number associated with the received log of call-related information; see column 2, lines 6 - 16.

Wood differs from the claimed invention with respect to the features of sending a subscriber identification request for display at the subscriber terminal; receiving a response to the subscriber identification request including subscriber authentication

Art Unit: 2614

data; and validating the subscriber authentication data. However, such security measures are well known and ubiquitous in any remote log in environment, otherwise anyone could access any information. And Isono plainly teaches such features at column 13, lines 43 – 64 in another system of providing remote access to call-related information. Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the authentication/validation features of Isono into the system of Wood in order to provide more security when remotely accessing data or information.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5-14, 19-28, and 31-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 15, and 29 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/749,828 Page 5

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harry S. Hong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

December 4, 2008